NO. 89-880

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUL 17 1990
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1989

IN THE MATTER OF JOHN R. WOODWARD, III
vs.
PETITIONER
JOE DAVID JACKSON, Assistant General Counsel to the STATE BAR OF GEORGIA AND SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA AS ITS ALTER EGO: AND THOMAS J. RATCLIFFE, JR., SPECIAL MASTER, ALTER EGO FOR THE SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA: AND WILEY S. OBENSHAIN, III, CHAIRMAN, REVIEW PANEL, SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA, ALTER EGO STATE BAR OF GEORGIA
DEFENDANTS

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO
THE SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA IN DISCIPLINARY CASE NUMBER 278, STATE DISCIPLINARY BOARD DOCKET NUMBER 859.

Petition to review order of Supreme Court of Georgia on April 5, 1989, rehearing denied on May 11, 1989, CIVIL CASE, allowing 90 days from 5-11-89 to docket.

JOHN R. WOODWARD, III
Pro Se-Admitted-U.S.
Supreme Court 5-12-1980
for Petitioner
410 N. Palm St.
Jesup, Georgia 31545
1-912-427-3474
State Bar of Georgia
No: 0775800-2

28 U.S.C. Sec. 2101 (c).
Rule 20.4

EDITOR'S NOTE:

THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE POOR HARD COPY AT THE TIME OF FILMING. IF AND WHEN A BETTER COPY CAN BE OBTAINED, A NEW FICHE WILL BE ISSUED.

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW HEREIN

Are Constitutional protections violated by enforcement of U.S.vs. DENNIS,645 F.2nd,page 517 in conflict of laws with The Surety Bank and Trust Company vs. Tarlton, 294 FEderal Reporter,page 698, in the BAnkruptcy Forum under 11 U.S.C., Section 303,Bankruptcy Act effective 10-1-1979,as to constitute basis for State of Georgia Disciplinary Proceedings under 219 Ga.,p. 873,as amended, and denial of ruling on Motion for Summary Judgment-for a jury trial-by the trial Court Judge,regarding claims filed under

4"Claim" means- (A)Right of payment,whether or not such right is reduced to judgment,liquidated,unliquidated,fixed,contingent,matured,unmatured,disputed,undisputed, equitable,secured,or unsecured;or (B) right to an equitable remedy for breach of performance if such breach gives rise to a right to payment,whether or not such right to an equitable remedy is reduced to judgment,fixed,contingent,matured, unmatured,disputed,undisputed,secured,or unsecured;

when opposing counsel realigns claimants for alleged bankrupt under DENNIS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS page

QUESTION PRESENTED..... i

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES.....iii,iV

PARTIES TO PROCEEDINGS..... 1

REFERENCE TO CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, BANKRUPTCY AND BAR STANDARDS 2

JURISDICTION..... 3

STATEMENT OF THE CASE..... 4-12

REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT.... 13-36

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE..... 37

Appendix A-Georgia Supreme Court order of April 5,1989 Rehearing denied on May 11,1989.....1a-7a

Appendix B-Special Master Fin. Order 1-30-1989 &Review Panel Passe "

Appendix C-Prel.Order of Sp.Master 12-4-1984 8a

Appendix D-State Bar Fee Arb.Order 6-20-1983 9a

Appendix E-U.S.Dist.Ct.Order of 8-12-1982 No.481-4 10a

Appendix F-11th Cir.Order-Judge Godbold 7-8-1982 Case 81-7265 11a

Appendix G-Bankruptcy Case 280-157 Judge Coolidge:1-16-81 12a

Appendix H-State Bar of Ga.Order of 6-30-1989 of Rule 65 placed inactive on 1988-1989 Demand Deposit check unlawfully claimed to be Trust Acct.Check. 13a

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES

CASES page

In Re Barkeley,160 N.Y.C.,1093 27

Bennett vs. Cannon.....144 Ga.App. 479.23

In Re D.D.International Disc.Corp.. 16
13 B.R.,p. 635 ... 24

Charleston v. Littlepage,805 SE 131...15

Matter of Claxton,21 B.R. 905..... 16

In Re Covey, 650 F2nd,877. 2

Georgia Disciplinary Law,219 Ga.873...2,6

Farmers vs.First Va.Bank of Fairfax County,Virginia, B.R. Vol.9,p.532.... 24

IN RE HALZER, 22 BR,p. 326..... 16

U.S. vs DENNIS,645 F2nd 517.....25,23,5,6,12,17

In Re Heinrich,10 Illinois 2nd,357...27

Hertz vs United States,18 F2nd,52... 15

Herbert Middner v.Frank A.Gudotta... 1,3
405 F.Supplementp.182

Hicks vs.Feilock,108 Sup.Ct.1423.... 14

Ga.Power Co.vs.Busbin,242 Ga.p.612.. 25

FARMer's Mutual Exchange vs.J.G.ordon.21
Harris,Wayne Superior Ct.,Settled.....21

John Doe,Esq.,Appellant vs.The Federal Grievance COmmittee 847 F2nd, page 57..... 17

21

Superior Court,settled after suit.. 21

In Re Martinez,22 B.R.,p.419..... 15

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES-Continued page

Patty vs. Board of Medical Examiners 19
(9 Cal.3rd 356 (1973)

Neely vs. Oliver Farm Equipment Sale, 20
52 Ga.App.,p.166,167(1)

In Re O'Brien,95 Vt. 167.....24

Lenihan vs. Commonwealth of Ky.....26
165 Ky.93

In Re Paul W.Myrick-case 276-33
U.S.Bankruptcy Ct.,S/D/Ga.....21

Pearl Coal Company,115 F.2nd 158....16

In Re Rice,14 B.R.,p.843.....17

SCHAFER VS. State Board of Veterin- 18
ary Medicine,143 Ga.App.,p.69.....

Smith vs. Johnson, 29 SE,p.509..... 24

The Surety Bank & Trust Company vs. 5
Tarlton, 294 Fed.Reporter,p.698.....11

Sacher vs. United States,343U.S.118.23

In Re-Hal W.Vaughn,Jr.,Supreme Court
of Georgia Disciplinary Case#598...26
requiring Superior Court Judge to
review Summary Judgment order and
Jury trial demand. 6

Wiley vs.Ga.Power Co.134 Ga.App.187. 25

Woodward vs Lawson,225 Ga.p.261....20

Pharr vs.McDonald,180 Ga.,p.777... 23

Gregory Sheffield vs.C.L.C.Child...14
vs.Bettina Faith Goff Harrison,
Wayne Sup.Ct.Case 88-CV-0396,viol-
ating Hicks v.Philock 108 SC1423
Supreme Ct.Ga. case No. 4662.

No. 89-

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE
UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM, 1989

IN THE MATTER OF JOHN R. WOODWARD, III,

PETITIONER

VS.

JOE DAVID JACKSON, ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL TO THE STATE BAR OF GEORGIA AND SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA AS ITS ALTER EGO: AND THOMAS J. RATCLIFF, JR., SPECIAL MASTER, ALTER EGO FOR THE SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA: And WILEY S.. OBENSHAIN, III, CHAIRMAN, REVIEW PANEL, SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA ALTER EGO,

DEFENDANTS

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO
THE SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA IN
DISCIPLINARY CASE NUMBER 278, STATE
DISCIPLINARY BOARD DOCKET NO. 859.

Petitioner's petition to review the decision of the SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA of April 5, 1989, rehearing denied on May 11, 1989, allowing 90 days to file this Petition for Certiorari under:

Herbert MILDNER vs. Frank GULOTTA, Indiv. and as Presiding Justice, New York
405 Federal Supplement, page 182, USDC, E/D, New York October 9, 1975.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS,TREATIES, STATUTES,ORDINANCES AND REGULATIONS

U.S.CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT V

U.S.CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT XIV

U.S.CODE TITLE II-EFFECTIVE 10-1-1979 INVOLUNTARY BANKRUPTCY Under Section 303

U.S.CODE TITLE II-EFFECTIVE 10-1-1979 CLaim Definition under 101 DEFINITIONS: (4) "Claim" MEans-(A)

RUle 5-101 of Part V of the Rules and Regulations of the Organization and Government of the State Bar of Georgia, under 219 Ga Reports,page 873,as Amended

11 U.S.C.Sec. 101 (4)(A)-Claim means right to payment -IN RE COVEY,650 F.2d, 877 (June 5,1981)Alleged Bankrupt was generally not paying debts as those debts came due. All creditors must be listed.

11 U.S.C.Sec.303 (h) (1),(j) and"Only after notice to all creditors and a hearing may the court dismiss a petition filed under this section.

11 U.S.C. SEc.322 (a) Trustee is rep.of Estate in Involuntary Bankruptcy cases.

U.S.CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT VII

U.S.CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT VIII

COMMERCIAL LAW LEAGUE OF AMERICA RULES.

RIGHT OF ATTORNEY TO PURSUE CASE WHEN CLIENT SETTLES AND MAKES AGREEMENTS NOT KNOWN TO ATTORNEY REALIGNING CLIENT FOR OPPOSING PARTY.

JURISDICTION

Petitioner invokes this court's jurisdiction to review the final judgment of the Supreme Court of Georgia, decided April 5,1989, reconsideration review was denied May 11,1989.

The basis for Federal Jurisdiction is 28 U.S.C.A., Section 1257 (2); Judiciary Law, N.Y., Sec.90; as upheld in the case of HERBERT MILDNER vs. FRANK A. GULOTTA, Individually and as Presiding Justice, Appellate Division of the State of New York, Defendant, HOLDING: 405 F.Supp182 Disciplined attorneys in state of New York are not without a remedy if state courts act erroneously in that attorneys may apply directly to United States Supreme Court for review.

Full Faith and Credit must be given to such rulings in all the States of the United States for Supreme Court of the United States review as so held in the State of New York, above, decision, HEADNOTE 20, under Civil Rights, 42 U.S.C.A., Sec.1983 and due process and equal protections under the 5th and 14the Amendments.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

-THis case involves an Involuntary Bankruptcy petition,under U.S.Code TITLE II, Section 303,effective 10-1-1979,and the hearing ordered for January 16,1981, as Petitioners were FOREMOST MCKESSON,INC., FOR-MAC,INC., VALU-RITE PHARMACIES,INC., INTERVENORS WERE WHITEHALL LABORATORIES, INC., AD VANTAGE AD, INC.,ATTY. WOODWARD, FOR ADJUDICATION OF ATTORNEY'S FEES AS COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONING AND INTERVENING CREDITORS CONVERTED AND REALIGNED FOR THE ALLEGED BANKRUPT, RALPH B.SMITH,D/B/A JESUP PHARMACY, A sole Proprietorship in U/S/B/Ct.S/D/Ga/ Case No. 280-00157,by a STING operation,Entrapment,Scam, managed by opposing Counsel and the COURT,after filing notice of representation dated the 12th day of January,1981 with motion for intervention by intervenors,resulting in a judicial ambush conspiracy to defeat the Bankruptcy and obstruct justice and viol-Constitutional guarantees of the U.S. CONSTITUTION.

Upon receipt of the motion for intervention by Atty.Leaphart,Jan.13,1981,he at once contacted clients of atty.Woodward under guise of Tarlton,Supra,294 Fed. Reporter,p.698, using U.S. vs.DENNIS, 645 F.2nd 517 as his conflict of interest violation,perverting established law and sharing this information of realigning respondent's clients for defendant with Judge Coolidge made aware of his acts for the January 16,1981 trial of Alleged Bankrupt,Ralph B.Smith,D/B/A Jesup Pharmacy. Ruth Kahn of Ad Vantage Ad,Inc.,testified in her deposition before Atty.Pike,of the Wisconsin Bar that Alvin Leaphart had called her so many times that he had her all screwed up. Tarlton,Supra, 294 Fed Rpt'r.- does not contemplate contacting clients of Atty.Woodward in the same case after the January 13,1981 notice of representation for intervention hearing 1-16-1981.

Judge Coolidge then,at the hearing, interrupted Leaphart and took over the questioning in a base and vile manner as

prearranged with Leaphart and as seen in transcript record of the 1-16-1981 hearing showing a Sting operation with the vile intensity of questioning,illegal object of Title 11, Section 303 of the Bankruptcy law,all of which was prearranged between Colidge and Leaphart,shown by transcript. Such acts require disbarment of Leaphart and Coolidge in the State Bar of Georgia, Administrative Arm of the Supreme Court of the State of Georgia.ATty.Woodward was entitled to adjudication of his Atty. fee with Ad Vantage Ad,Inc.,converted to client of Ralph B.Smith,by Atty.Leaphart after notice on Jan.13,1981.Mr.Staub,of Whitehall Laboratories,inIndiana called and stated Atty.Leaphart had called him criticizing Atty.Woodward when Don Hutchinson,Cr.Mgr.Formac,Inc.,had contacted him for intervention. Leaphart sought to impress the Court and clients of Atty.Woodward he was a shyster lawyer, in violation of DENNIS,645 F.2nd,517.

Atty.Woodward never dealt with Secretary Ruth Kahn-only with Credit Manager,Doris Powless.Leaphart and Coolidge dealt with Ruth Kahn.See letter of Ruth Kahn to the Mary Becton,Bankruptcy Clerk, recieved on 2-17-1981 from Ruth Kahn,copied to Leaphart,who converted Ad Vantage Ad,Inc., and Whitehall Laboratories,Inc., and realigned same for Ralph B.Smith,D/B/A/Jesup Pharmacy and copy to former attorney, on Jan. 12,1981,JOhn R.Woodward,III,after the client hijacking by Leaphart between Jan. 13,1981 and January 16,1981, after Leaphart learned Atty.Woodward had filed notice of motion for intervention.Since Coolidge employed three different Court Reporters, Mary Bector;Hazel Snow,David Adams, and the viscious Sting by Coolidge and Leaphart.Atty.Woodward became the accused and alleged Bankrupt,Ralph B.Smith,D/B/A/ Jesup Pharmacy, testified he never heard

of Ad Vantage Ad,Inc.,nor their claim for $925. reduced to $182.,that he turned all his creditors names,addresses,amounts owed, date of last payment,over to Atty.Leaphart to answer the involuntary Bankruptcy and Smith swore he did exactly as Leaphart told him to do and what to swear to as shown in the transcript of the 1-16-1981 trial.WHY DID SMITH NOT INCLUDE THE SOME $60,000.embezzled from his Ward,Incompetent,H.G.Smith as a debt due to his own siblings,for which his bondsman,Transamerica Insurance Company is still owed the $60,000.as bondsman,for Smith on the bond?

Why did not Smith include the $17,500. owed David Jelks,for lot 33,ROGERS'Store in Hinesville,Liberty Co.,Ga. where funds skimmed from the Jesup Pharmacy operation were being used to build the clothing inventory operated by Betty Clark Smith, wife of Ralph B.Smith,D/B/A/Jesup Phcy?

The Contempt Trial in August,1981,before Judge B.Avant Edenfield, did not result in a sentence of contempt in the presence of tty.Woodward in the presence of the Court,and is therefore totally illegal and void and of no force and effect.

The Fee Arbirtation Committee of the State Bar of Georgia refused to award fee to Atty.Woodward,III,from the 1-16-1981 trial of Ralph B.Smith, who testified falsely as to $60,000.embezlement and the $17,500.owed David Jelks.Judge Coolidge refused to deduct insiders, De Minimus Creditors, preferred and secured creditors,and did not require Ralph B.Smith, D/B/A/JEsup Pharmacy to list the lot 33 in Hinesvill,Ga.,known as ROGERS' Store, operated by Smith's Wife,where profits of Jesup Pharmacy and Liberty Prarmacy were being skimmed from same to build the business of Rogers Clothing Store in

Hinesville,Liberty Co.,Ga. on Lot 33 in the building purchased on credit from the Jelks' Family.Judge Coolidge refused a final argument to Woodward,stating"YOU MAY NOT" make a final statement that would show conspiracy with Leaphart to contact client of Atty.Woodward;refusal to require a list of all creditors,names,addresses,date incurred,amount paid and amount due;refusal to refer the case to a TRUSTEE not related to Judge's Brother, C.F.Coolidge,III,who represented the A.N.BANK,Brunswick,that held a mortgage on Ralph B.Smith's property,disqualifying Judge Coolidge,for the IMRROPRIETY OF SUCH ACT and COLLUSION with LEaphart,refusal to have Smith and Leaphart investigated for Perjury and subordination to purjury under the admission of Leaphart to intermeddling with the clients of respondent and false swearing by Smith at insistance of Leaphart.

Attorney Woodward's letter of 12-30-1980 to his client shows $925. due Ad Vantage Ad,Inc. by Ralph B.Smith,D/B/A/Jesup Phcy., that day and later the amount was changed to $182.00 when Dun and Bradstreet,Inc., said to discontinue efforts to collect. Dun and Bradstreet,Inc.was only a forwarder,not a client,had nothing to do with the case,Leaphart was not legally authorized to contact Ruth Kahn,Secretary under TARLTON, 294 Fed.Reporter,p.698,nor Mr. Straub,Cr.Mgr.of WHITEHALL LABORATORIES, INC.,after January 13,1981.Jan.12,1981, Mrs. Doris POwless was called to affirm the case funds were due,that Atty.Woodward,III,was entitled to a fee ($925.or$182) that a fee was due,and response was:"go ahead if you think there is a chance to collect the amount due!"The intervention of WHITEHALL LABORATORIES,INC., AD VANTAGE AD.,INC. and for JOHN R.WOODWARD,III, was entered on 1-13-1981 noticed to Leaphart who contacted clients of Atty.

Woodward in violation of U.S. VS.DENNIS, 645 F.2nd 517, placing Dun and Bradstreet, Inc.,and Alvin Leaphart,out of the case as representation was in Woodward to recover Atty.Fees due as the motion for intervention was so filed.Leaphart sought to defeat same,apprised Judge Coolidge, conversed with Coolidge in the hallway of Federal Building on 1-16-1981,totally gave "the appearance of impropriety" to respondent,disqualifying both,wher upon,the Judge dismissed the case "Sua Sponte",disallowed all intervention motions,again threatened damages,consisting of Court Costs and Atty Fees,then ordered himself "ABSTAINED" under Title 11,Sec.305,brought in the STATE BAR OF GEORGIA FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION,then, signed an order of contempt of court on John R.Woodward,III.in a vile and viscious manner,as in prior cases without the bar association references and contempt.

REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT

The State Bar of Georgia recieved the record of the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals from Judge John C.Godbold in 1982, with no ordered requirement to do anything. State Bar General Counsel,Omer Franklin,Jr. and Judge Herman Coolidge were classmates in law school.

Georgia Associate Justice Robert Jordfound "Probable Cause"for State Bar inquiry and Special Master,Thomas Ratcliffe,Jr., also of Hinesville,Liberty County,Georgia, business address of Ralph B.Smith's wife, Betty Clark Smith,and her ROGERS'Clothing business was located,and place of employment of Ralph B.Smith,at Eckerd Pharmacy, are both employed,was appointed and who illegally and maliciously denied to the Respondent,John R.Woodward,III, a jury trial,demanded before answer to the charge of Judge Omer W.Franklin,Jr. and the

State Bar of Georgia, Administrative Arm of the Supreme Court of Georgia, where Chief Justice Thomas O. Marshall, from Americus, Sumter County, Georgia, the same place as is John Gilbert, Majority Stockholder and chief Counsel for the American National Bank, are natives, thusly acquainted herein.

The Contempt order of District Court Judge B. Avant Edenfield, of 1982, contravene laws of Georgia and the United States in that John R. Woodward, III, was not present in Court at the times of the orders issued by Judge Enenfield, violative of HICKS vs. FEILOCK, 56 U.S.L.W. 4347; 99 L Ed 2nd 721; 108 Sup. Ct., 1423, requiring presence of respondent before any effective order.

The effort of Assistant State Bar Counsel, Joe David Jackson, and Special Master Thomas J. Ratcliffe, Jr., to use the order and evidence of the Contempt trial of Judge Edenfield, to circumvent and void the jury trial demand voids the orders

of Special Master Thomas J.Ratcliff,Jr. by allowing void orders of Judge Edenfield to influence his decision as special master under HERTZ VS. UNITED STATES , 18 Federal, Reporter, (8th Cir., 1927) (Minnesota) 2nd,page 52,holding"A trial for contempt cannot be retried into a trial for disbarment in another forum."

Therefore,the evidence and orders in the Contempt action are totally inadmissible in a disciplinary proceedings under Mr.Ratcliff, under all circumstances. Under Charleston vs. Littlepage, 80 S.E.,p.131,the authority of an attorney cannot be contested after a countersuit has been filed. Why did Mr. Leaphart contact clients intervening?after he had answered the suit,contrary to law?

The discharge of Ralph B.Smith,D/B/A/ JeSup Pharmacy,Jan.16,1981,after he had acted with intent to defraud the Court on request of Alvin Leaphart,required his denial of discharge.B.Code 11 USCA,101, 727(a)(21)(A),(a)(4)IN RE MARTINEZ, 22 Bankruptcy Reports,page 419.

By the defrauding of Bankruptcy Court by Smith and Leaphart,1-16-1981,did not entitle Smith,D/B/A/Jesup Pharmacy,to discharge and dismissal of the case. IN RE HALZER, 22 B.R. 326;11 U.S.C.A.1976 Section 32(c),(1,2,4),New York, 1982.

By permitting withdrawl of Ad Vantage d,Inc.,Whitehall Laboratories,Inc., on 1-16-1981,disallowing intervention, the Bankruptcy Court defied Federal Law: Matter of Claxton,21 B.R.p. 905;Rule 708 required the full statement of the basis and value of the Ad Vantage Ad,Inc.,claim which was denied by Judge Coolidge, who also denied requirement of Rule 104(e)for Smith to submit a list of all his creditors to determine if Smith was generally not paying his debts as they accrued,and became due.Pearl Coal Co.,115 F.2nd,158. Judge Coolidge violated In Re B.D. International Discount Corp.,13 B.R.,p.635 allowing single creditor with claim of over $5,000.with legit.creditors.

In Re Rice ,14 B.R. p.843 required that Judge Coolidge strike all answers filed by Ralph B.Smith,D/B/A/Jesup Pharmacy.

The order of January 16,1981 of Judge Coolidge,transcribed in the Record shows Smith testified Leaphart had told him the creditors to file from the list furnished to Leaphart-that amounted to fraud on the tribunal ,as both knew of the lie from the list furnished as being incomplete as they had a duty to disclose.See JOhn Doe,Esq. Appellant,vs.The Federal Grievance Committee ,847 F.2nd,p. 57;ABA COde of Prof Resp.DC 7-102(B)(2),1975. Under U.S. vs. DENNIS, Supra,Leaphart had confiscated and realigned AD Vantage Ad,Inc. for the alleged bankrupt,Ralph B.Smith, D/B/A/ Jesup Pharmacy,and Whitehall Laboratories, Inc.,seeking to reduce the number of creditors below 12 who were not insiders, secured,preferred and secured creditors,and

Judge Coolidge refused to so notify all creditors,listed or not.The dismissal of the case was contrary to law and fact. Judge Coolidge ceased to act as a Judge-became a Simon Degree with many questions of entrapment under Ga. Law, as denoted under SCHAFFER VS. STATE BOARD OF VETERINARY MEDICINE ,143 Ga.App.,p69 "Where the prosecutor is also acting as the legal advisor for a hearing board,we must closely scrutenize the relationship between the two.Where it appears that the prosecutor has prevailed upon the board in an unfair manner,the board's decision should not be affirmed." There is no criminal responsibility where the (1) idea and intention of the crime originated with the state agent;(2)the act was induced by the agent's undue persuasion, incitement,or deceit;and(3)the crime would not have been committed but for the agent's conduct.....However,we feel that entrapment should be considered as a defense in an administrative proceeding such as this,where the professional

licensee is facing charges which could result in the loss of his right to engage in that profession. Next to loss of freedom comes the loss of one's means to a livelihood. The function of the enforcement officials is to investigate,not to instigate,crime;to discover,not to promote, administrative violations with the help of opposing counsel. See Patty vs. Board of Medical Examiners, 9 Cal.3rd 356(1973); 508 P2nd 1121,61 ALR3rd 342). Sound public policy and good morals are incompatable with entrapment of an innocent person into the commission of a crime in order to revoke his professional license as clearly as they are incompatable with entrapment in order to obtain a criminal conviction. The public's concern with the fair administration of justice attaches equally to administrative as to judicial proceedings. Entrapment defense is also available in an administrative defense the same as a criminal defense. Such induced fall from professional standards after years of circumspection.should not rightfully result in the loss of a professional license.

The report of Wiley S.Obenshain,III, January 30,1989,Chairman of the State Bar Review Panel reflects the false order of Judge Coolidge of January 16,1981, regarding alleged false statements of Respondent brought to the January 16,1981 hearing by Leaphart,Smith and Judge Coolidge for fraud: "Concealment of material facts may in itself amount to fraud,where direct

inquiry is made and truth evaded."Neely vs. Oliver Farm Equipment Sales Co.,52 Ga.App. 166,167 (1) (182 SE 630) (1935).Leaphart indicated at the 1-16-1981 trial that he had talked with RUTH KAHN,Secretary of Ad Vantage Ad.,Inc., in Wisconsin,who denied conversation with Respondent.Judge Coolidge immediately cut Leaphart short and assumed questioning to a base and vile tone and attitude of a criminal prosecutor rather than a Bankruptcy Court Judge. Respondent was entitled to attorney's fees for services rendered,10% of difference $925.&$182. and quantum meruit for services rendered, all in violation of U.S.Public Policy that separates Judiciary from Prosecutorial Act of Judge Coolidge in his continued bias vs Respondent ordered by Obenshain to be irrelevent and immaterial making the order false as adopted by the Supreme Court on April 5,1989.Prior Superior Court acts of Leaphart in the Woodward vs Lawson case,

225 Ga.p.261 and in the case of Farmer's Mutual Exchange vs James Gordon Harris and McCombs vs William Bird,Sr. reflect a bent of mind of Leaphart to do the same act of contacting clients of the Respondent after the case lodged with Respondent for legal action showing a bias and prejudice of Leaphart and Judge Coolidge on January 16,1981 reflected in the order of Mr. Obenshain and in the same reflected in the April 5,1989 order of the Supreme Court of Georgia that rubber stamps the prior orders from 1-16-1981.

Judicial bias against an attorney is also shown in the Bankruptcy Court case entitled IN RE PAUL W. MYRICK ,U.S.Bankruptcy Court,S/D/Ga/ File No. 276-33,FRC Access Number 021-81-0154;FRC Location No.E0800924 EAN,Agency Box No. 38,Federal Archives and Records Center, 1557 St.Joseph Avenue,East Point,Georgia,30344,where Paul Myrick,D/B/A/Myrick Construction was served with an Involuntary Bankruptcy Petition by clients of Respondent Woodward Myrick being client of Atty.John D.Mattox, who contacted MRs. Hubert Sessoms to file

an affidavit in Bankruptcy Court that she withdraws the claim made for Hubert Sessoms,filed by Atty. Lee O'Brien,now Assistant Solicitor,State Court of Fulton County, Georgia, under Judge Westmoreland,thus reducing the claims below the $1,000.mark requiring Judge COolidge to dismiss the Involuntary Bankruptcy petition of creditors.This is important in that Atty. Lee O' Brien,while associated with Mattox,was appointed to a drug case to represent a young girl by the court and was slapped and harrassed by one Alex Hopkins,at the time,now deceased,client of Leaphart.Mr. O'Brien remarked that he could either leave Jesup or kill Hopkins.He chose to leave and became Assistant Solicitor in Atlanta.

Leaphart sought to reduce the number of creditors on 1-16-1981 by having contacted Ruth Kahn of Ad Vantage Ad,Inc., so many times that according to her deposition he had her "all screwed up";Leaphart also contracted Mr.Straub,Cr.Mgr.,Whitehall Laboratory claimant,also, to try to reduce that claim,also,and failed to do so.

On January 16,1981 Ad Vantage Ad,Inc. was the client of Alvin Leaphart and Ralph B.Smith, in violation of in Re DENNIS, Supra,contacting clients of Respondent.

The rubber-stamp of Judge Coolidge by the State Bar of Georgia, Justice Robert Jordan,Judge Omer Franklin,Jr.,Judge Morgan of 11th U.S.Circuit Ct.of Appeals,Judge John C.Godbold, Special Master THomas Ratcliff, Jr., REview Panel under Mr.Obenshein,and Joe David Jackson for the Supreme Court of Georgia,on April 5,1989,all reflect the same LEAPHART interference in the attorney client relationship with Ad Vantage Ad,Inc. and Whitehall Laboratories,Inc. contrary to U.S. vs DENNIS, SUpra,requiring disbarment of Leaphart and Herman Coolidge; the orders contravene Bennett vs.Cannon, 114 Ga.App.,p 479,481,to defeat the Atty. lien of Atty Woodward,under law, who has the right to prosecute the suit,in the name of his client,for the recovery of his fees-DEFIED BY THE LOWER COURTS, ALL CONTRARY TO LAW.See Pharr vs.McDonald, 180 Ga.,page 777.and under Sacher vs. U.S., 343 U.S. 118 (1952).

Judge Herman Coolidge sought to bar Atty. fee relief to Respondent Woodward on 1-16-1981 by his order of ABSTAINTIONS under Section 305(c) that was absolutely void on his order under Farmers vs.First Virginia Bank of Fairfax County , B.R. Vol.9,p.532. Judge Coolidge has been voted by the Bar of his Court to be using his own rules rather than the Federal Bankruptcy Laws as shown in this perversion of the law shown above.

The presumption in favor of respondent of authority is by clear preponderance of the evidence and the Bankruptcy Judge was clearly erroneous in denying the right to represent the clients for whom he filed the interventions.Smith vs.Johnson, 29 SE 509 (44 W.Va.,p.278);Charleston vs.Littlepage, 80 SE,p.131 (73 W.Va. p.156).

"Confrontation of witnesses in jury trial demand is required in all disbarment cases where there has been an acquittal for perjury and giving false testimony in the same case regarding the same matters See In Re:O'Brien, 95 Vt. 167;113 Atlantic 527, 14ALR 859.

The Supreme Court of Georgia via Bar Counsel including Alvin Leaphart,Board of Governor,Defense Counsel,Joe David Jackson, and they seek to destroy Respondent's employment contract with Ad Vantage Ad, Inc., by claiming the corporate forwarder, Dun and Bradstreet,Inc. is authorized to practice law(Unlawful in Georgia)and that notice from them as a third party required Respondent Woodward to cease working on the case to earn his fee and collect the principal,$925.or $182. on 1-16-1981 denies authorization by Ad Vantage Ad,Inc.That is false under OTT VSGANDY , 66 Ga.App.,681 (1)"Even tho a person's employment contract is at will,he has a valuable contract right which may not be unlawfully interferred with by a third party."Upheld Ga.Power Co.vs.Busbin , 242 Ga.p. 612,615;Wiley vs.Ga.Power Co., 134 Ga.App.,p.187,190.Neither Leaphart, Coolidge, the State Bar nor the Georgia Supreme Court can interfere therewith, the ongoing contract with Ad Vantage Ad, Inc.,in violation of U.S.vsDENNIS,Supra. Model Code DR 2-104(A)(1)shows legal if attorney believes it to be a client.

"An attorney accused of misconduct is entitled to confront witnesses and subject them to cross examination."Lenihan vs. Commonwealth, 165 Ky.93;176 S.W. 948; In Re-ELDRIDGE. The Supreme Court of Georgia illegally denied a jury trial to Woodward, and there is absolutely no law disallowing removal of a civil trial from one County to another on the ground of bias,prejudice, as shown in the record as existing in the Superior Court of Wayne County,Georgia,and Special Master Thomas J.Ratcliffe,Jr.,also illegally denied a jury trial to WOODWARD, illegally refused to rule in writing on finding of fact and law as to all issues; and illegally refused to refer the denial of jury trial and for summary judgment to a superior Court Judge as required by Rule 4-102 for review by a Superior Court Judge under Rule 215 (b)and(d) on the jury trial demand of before Nov.23,1982 in writing.IN RE HAL W.VAUGHN,JR.,case 598 .

The Supreme Court of Georgia denied to the respondent the complete record from Bankruptcy Court, District Court, Fee Arbitration Board of the State Bar of Georgia, 11th U. S. Circuit Ct. of Appeals, and also denied same to Thomas J. Ratcliff, Jr., Special Master who only relied on Joe David Jackson, Bar Counsel, to supply him piecemeal of the complete record in total defiance of: IN RE BARKELEY, 160 N.Y.C. 1093; 174 App. Div., 205 holding: "Hearsay is Inadmissible. Only complete record in other cases is admissible in a disciplinary proceeding."

THomas Ratcliffe, Jr., Special Master, was under letter threat and collusion from Joe David Jackson and Alvin Leaphart to rule on incomplete evidence without the demanded jury trial in a fair forum or suffer removal of the case from his office as Special Master, shown by the record.

Therefore, Ratcliff, as Special Master, was disqualified under: IN RE HEINRICH, 10 Illinois, 2nd, p. 357, where a fair forum and jury trial has been denied and the complete record is not of record from listed courts.

The real question at issue in a disbarment proceeding is the public interest and an attorney's right to continue to practice a profession imbued with public trust. In Re Fisher, 179 F2nd 361; and the Attorney is entitled to cross-examine all witnesses against him under due process, Spencks vs. Klein, 385 U.S. 511, 515, and an opportunity to be heard, Goldberg vs. Kelly, 397 U.S., p269, denied to Respondent on January 16, 1981, by Bankruptcy Ct. Judge Herman W. Coolidge, who denied a final argument to Respondent. See Willner vs. Committee on Character and Fitness, 373 U.S., p.96 . Judge Coolidge sought to and did deny procedural due process of law by denial of cross-examination of Leaphart and did not rely upon the statements of this respondent in any form, Leaphart and Coolidge already knowing the answer to questions propounded by Coolidge on 1-16-1981 under In Re Ming, 469 F.2nd, 1352, seeking an

entrapment of respondent in an administrative inventigation of Ralph B.Smith,D/B/A Jesup Pharmacy end to Respondent's livelihood forever. A license to practice law constitutes a type of "NEW PROPERTY" the divestment of which cannot be affected without affording substantial due process of law ,including the opportunity to be heard and to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses,as Leaphart and Coolidge. The unequal protection and application of State and Federal law,fair on its face,may act as denial of due process,as has been shown.See Yick Wo vs. Hopkins,118 U.S., p. 356,373-74, 6 Sup.Ct.,p.1064.

THere was never a prior investigation by the State Bar of Georgia and nothing prior to APril 5,1989 to show any prior violations of Disciplinary rules on the clean record of Respondent . There was no Superior Court Judicial review of the findings of Summary Judgment by Ratcliff,

on the denial of summary judgment for respondent as required by Bar Rules.There was no disclosure of the Superior Court Judge ruling on the Respondent's Motion for Summary judgment. There was no waiver of a jury trial in a fair forum and there is no law preventing the agreement for trial to be in a fair forum it being found Wayne Superior Court judiciary and personnel in charge are biased against this respondent as shown by the cases of record herein.

There is absolutely no continuity and equality in the requirements of the order of April 5,1989 as compared to all States and Disciplinary relief to the public.The usual relief to the public being only two months suspension.The maximum of 6 months.None of the(other) 50 states require taking the State Bar Examination on simular charges. THe order of 4-5-1989 being a perversion.

The order of April 5,1989 being a hybrid perversion of the fact finding and truth seeking process of relief to the public. See DCD PRograms,Ltd. vs.Leighton, 846 F2nd 526,where actual judicial action on a fraudulent misrepresentation of record was two months suspension in the 9th U.S. C,rcuit Court of A^Ppeals. Under 847 F2nd p.57,John Doe,Esquire vs.THe Federal Grievance COmmittee,under DR 1-103 (B) the suspension was six (6)months. The right to practice law in the State of Georgia may not abrogate federally protected rights as guaranteed under the 14th Amendment that requires all persons simularly situated shall be treated alike for equal protection and under the 5th Amendment,due process of law under 42 U.S.C.A. Sec.1983,on the Constitution for Jurisdiction of this Federal Supreme Court to require a U.S. Constitutional Court to hear this under 28 US.Code,Section 2281,Jurisdiction.

There is a personal bias and prejudice of Wayne County Chief Judge and Senior Judge and the Clerk office and personnel as has been clearly demonstrated heretofore. The permission to take the State Bar Examination would never be forthcoming from same locally in Wayne County, Georgia, as a prerequisite of the bar examination in two years. Also, Bar Admissions after 1988 do require completion of a four-year accredited Law School before taking the bar exam after fitness and approval under 258 Ga., page 582, amending prior orders of the Supreme Court of Georgia to reduce the number of attorneys in Georgia, and requiring "Professionalism" requirements and seminars and ethical seminars of 12 credits annually. At age 60 this Respondent would not be in financial position to do the above in any manner or shape or fashion. The State Bar has a Demand Deposit Account for $110. check it claims to be a trust check and

plans to hold the claim as a disciplinary action vs.Respondent just in case he complies with the order of pril 5,1989 amounting to cruel and unusual punishment under the 8th and 14 U.S.Amendments simular to Gregg vs.Georgia, 428 U.S.,p 153,227 and 231 (1976),thus denying a Brady vs.Maryland suppression of evidence under 373 U.S.,p.83 (1963),not in good faith under U.S.vs.AGurs,427 U.S. 97., In Re Oliver,333 U.S. 257,273 (1948),and Pointer vs.Texas,380 U.S. 400 (1965), ratifying DAvis vs.Alaska ,415 U.S.p. 308. RESPONDENT denies he has been charged with any crime,is not and has not committed any crime, on January 16,1981, and violation of a Disciplinary Rule or Administrative Rule of the Supreme Court of Geor ia is not a crime under law and such allegation is scandalous and libelous as denoted in the Supreme Court order of April 5,1989. We see A.C.L.U.ATtorney

Millard Farmer has used the case of BURGER vs Kemp,Warden, Case 86-5375,decided 6-26-1987,41 Cr.L.3411,Cr.Law Reporter 41,pages 4-87 to 9-87 to describe Alvin Leaphart as:(1)COnstitutionally Inadequate as an Attorney;(2)rendered Ineffective Assistance of Counsel;(3)Failed to prove and show mitigating circumstances;(4)and had a Conflict of Interest with the Attorney in the companion Stevens case.(5)failed to bring up 17 yr.age minority at the time of the trial.(Recently ruled on by the Supreme Court of the United States.) Has Alvin Leaphart been disciplined by the SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA of this member of the Board of Governors giving counsel and advice to the Supreme Court? No!! Leaphart has been named to the panel to reduce the number of attorneys in the State of Georgia or the PAnel to improve justice to citizens and attorneys in the State of Georgia as a public service.

Respondent has not wilfully misrepresented any material fact on 1-16-1981,acted on by the opposite party or his attorney(Alvin Leaphart),or by the Court,who both knew Judge Coolidge's question and the answer. The U.S.Supreme Court has authority in this case to pre-empt State Law under Jones v. Rath,Packing Co.,430 U.S.519 and the order of April 5,1989,under the Supremacy Clause of Article VI of the U.S.Constitution,when there is a conflict as has been shown in the question presented for this review of the record.

The case of Pope vs. the State,at 179 Ga.App.p.739 (347 SE2nd 703)clearly shows that a State of Georgia Bar Standard does not rise to a misdemeanor or crime and cannot be used in a civil case under People vs. Ehle, 273 Illinois 424, and does not involve moral turpitude as the State Bar of Georgia placed in the order of April 5,1989. Standard and crime differ.

Respondent has at all times acted in good faith and under State Bar Standards of the State of Georgia,and there is reason to believe that the interpretation of State Bar Standards of 219 Ga.,873,et sec,as amended,as codified into Standards and rules are capricious,arbitrary,redundant, excessive,and overlap,and include crimes and standards that do not amount to crime and are thus so ambigious as to be totally biased and prejudiced and deprives all attorneys in Georgia,under the Rules, of guarantees of procedural and due process guaranteed by the Supreme Law of the Land, the CUnstitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States,and deny guaranteed rights to Respondent and to all attorneys simularly situated that denies jury trial and procedural due provess and right to cross-examine witnesses.

Respectfully Submitted,

John R. Woodward, III

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that three copies of the foregoing have been furnished to each of the following: Clerk,of Supreme Court of Georgia, Mrs.Joline B.Williams,244 Washington St.,SW,572 State Office Annex, Atlanta,Ga.,30334; WIley S.Obenshain,III, P.O.Box 1477(13) Augusta,Ga.,30913,Review Panel Chairman;Thomas J.Ratcliffe,Jr.,P.O. Box 469,Hinesville,Ga.,31313,Special Master;Joe David Jackson,Assistant Gen'l. Counsel,State Bar of Ga.,800 The Hurt Bldg. 50 Hurt Plaza,Atlanta,Ga.,30303; and one copy to Michael J.Bowers,Attorney General, State of Geor gia,132 State Judicial Bldg. Atlanta, Georgia,30334,in and by U.S.Mail with postage sufficient to insure delivery on this the 12th day of July,1989.

John R. Woodward, III

John R.Woodward,III,Pro Se
Admitted-U.S.Supreme Court
May 12,1980,for petitioner
410 N.Palm St.,
Jesup, Ga.,31545
1-912-427-3474

Memo-prior cases in Supreme Court:
Case No. 81-104,October Term,1981 entitled
Walter andAnita Blanton vs.
GEneral Electric Credit Corp.of
Georgia,Palace Industries,Inc.,
Mrs.Ellen Beasley

Case No.80-2121,October Term,1980 entitled
Edward Dean Martin vs The State
of Georgia - - - - - - - - - -

State Bar of Georgia Number 0775800-2

In the Supreme Court of Georgia
Decided: April 5,1989

IN THE MATTER OF JOHN R. WOODWARD,III.
(Supreme Court Disciplinary No. 278)

PER CURIAM.

The State Bar of Georgia brought disciplinary proceedings against John R. Woodward,III,charging him with violations of Standard 3 (illegal professional conduct involving moral turpitude), Standard 4 (professional conduct involving dishonesty,fraud,deceit, or wilful misrepresentation),and Standard 45 (knowingly making a false statement of law or fact in representation of a client). See State Bar Rule 4-102.

The Special Master and the Review Panel of the State Disciplinary Board found the following facts. In 1969,Dun & Bradstreet,Inc.,referred to the respondent a collection matter for Ad Vantage Ad,Inc.,against Ralph B.Smith,D/B/A Jesup Pharmacy. The respondent undertook efforts to collect the account. Ad Vant-

age discontinued these proceedings on November 26,1969. Dun and Bradstreet notified the respondent of this decision. From 1972 to 1979,the respodent had no contract with Ad Vantage and took no further action in an effort to collect the account. In December,1980, when the respondent initiated Involuntary-Bankruptcy proceedings in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Georgia against Smith,no attorney-client relationship existed between the respondent and Ad Vantage. Subsequent to filing the involuntary-Bankruptcy proceedings and on December 30,1980, the respondent corresponded with Ad Vantage, requesting authorization to include Ad Vantage in the bankruptcy proceedings. On January 8,1981, Ad Vantage replied in writing requesting that the respondent"(just forget the amount owed us." This letter was received by the respondent. In darly Jan-

uary,1981, probably subsequent to receipt of the letter of Ad Vantage,the respondent telephoned Ad Vantage,again seeking authorization to include it in the pending bankruptcy proceeding. At no time was the respondent authorized to bring an involuntary-bankruptcy action in the name of Ad Vantage. In a hearing before Judge Herman W. Coolidge, the bankruptcy-court judge, on January 16,1981, the respondent mis represented to Judge Coolidge his authority to act for Ad Vantage.

The respondent has filed with the State Disciplinary Board and this Court numerous exceptions to the report of the review panel, many of which seek to appeal other legal proceedings from both state and federal courts which are irrelevant to this proceeding. Under Bar Rule 4-214, the respondent is entitled to a jury trial in the county of his residence,Wayne County; since there are no provisions in

the Bar Rules for transfer of venue in disciplinary proceedings, and since the respondent specifically rejected a jury trial in Wayne County. Thus, the review panel correctly concluded that, under the foregoing circumstances, the respondent's request for a jury trial in Bryan County amounted to a waiver of his right to a jury trial in the county of his residence.

The Review Panel recommended that the respondent be suspended from the practice of law for a period of two years, and that he be required to take and pass the Georgia Bar Exam before any reconsideration for reinstatement.

After having reviewed the record, we approve and adopt the recommendation of the board. It is ordered that the suspension of John R. Woodward, III, from membership in the State Bar of Georgia and the suspension of his license to practice law in the State of Georgia for two years

commencing on May 1,1989, be approved of violations of standards 3,4 and 45 of the Rules of the State Bar of Georgia. It is further ordered that Woodward be fulfill all requirements for reinstatement including taking and passing the Georgia Bar Examination prior to his readmission to the Bar,and that he notify his clients of his suspension and take all actions necessary to protect their interests, as required by Bar Rule 4-219.

Suspended for two years. All the Justices concur.

CLERK'S OFFICE,SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA.

ATLANTA,May 3, 1989.

The motion for a rehearing was denied today:

Case No. 278,IN THE MATTER OF:

JOHN R. WOODWARD,III

Yours very truly,

/s/ Nathaniel Middleton

Mrs.Joline B.Williams,Clerk

(Note-this notice was damaged in U.S.Mail and not recieved until May 12,1989 by Respondent.)

Clerk's Office, Supreme Court of Georgia

Atlanta May 11,1989

The motion for a rehearing was denied today:

Case No. 278,IN THE MATTER OF:

JOHN R. WOODWARD,III

The Supplemental Motion and Brief has been treated as a motion for a rehearing and was denied today.

Yours very truly,

MRS.JOLINE B.WILLIAMS,CLERK

(Note-This notice was recieved by respondent on May 13,1989.)

(Respondent has 90 days from 5-11-89 to file 40 copies of petition for certiorari with the Clerk of the U.S. Supreme Court and $200. Adv.Ct.Cost.)

STATE BAR OF GEORGIA
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

June 12,1989

Mr. John R.Woodward,III
410 N.Palm Street
Jesup,Georgia,31545

Re.:Membership in the State Bar of Ga.

Dear Mr.Woodward:

You have written Susan Dallas letters on May 28th and May 29th,1989, which are somewhat confusing. I would like to try to explain to you your status with the State Bar of Georgia at this time.

The Supreme Court of Georgia has suspended your license to practice law for two years and require that you pass the Georgia Bar Exam for readmission. We will treat this as an indefinite suspension which cannot conclude earlier than two years and must conclude by your successful completion of the Georgia Bar Examination. Accordingly, you are hereby relieved of the duty to obtain CLE credits and pay bar dues from this time forward.

JDJ/cr

Very truly yours,
/s/
Joe David Jackson
Assistant General Counsel

cc:Nathaniel Middleton
Supreme Court of Georgia Docket Clerk

Gayle Baker
Membership Department-State Bar of Ga.

Susan Baker
Continuing Legal Education Department
State Bar of Georgia for credits

IN THE SUPREME COURT, STATE OF GEORGIA
DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS
In the Matter of: JOHN R.WOODWARD,III
Supreme Court Docket No. 278
State Disciplinary Board Docket No. 859

PRELIMINARY ORDER OF SPECIAL MASTER
THOMAS J. RATCLIFFE, JR. DATED 12-4-1984.

ITEM NO. 17 ofRULING of 12-4-1984.

MEMO of Respondent to this order No. 17

Requires the denial of Motion for Summary Judgment for Respondent must be referred Judge of Superior Court trying the case for review of the denial of Summary to Respondent,and name of Judge and order of Judge to handle the JURY TRIAL as demanded by Respondent must be furnished to Respondent by Special Master and Judge of Superior Court trying the case on the Jury trial. State Bar Disciplinary Rule No. 4-215 requiring the Superior Court Judge to rule on denied Summary Judgment of Special Master under RULE 4-215 (b) (1) and (d) and Superior Court Judgerules.

State Bar of Georgia

June 20, 1983

Mr. John R.Woodward,III
410 N.Palm Street
Jesup,Georgia,31545

Re.:Walter Blanton & Anita Blanton
Ralph B.Smith, D/B/A/ — Jesup Phcy.

Dear Mr. Woodward:

Fee Arbitration Rule 6-105, 247 Ga. A-2 (1980), governs the finality of the decision of the committee on the Arbitration of Atty. Fee Disputes not to accept jurisdiction of the referenced cases. A copy of that rule is enclosed for your convenience.

The next Board of Governors meeting is scheduled for August 20,1983,at Sawgras, Ponte Vedra Beach,Florida.

Your representatives from the Brunswich Circuit on the Board of Governors are:

J.Alvin Leaphart,Esquire
P.O.Box 977
Jesup,Ga.,31545
1-912-427-2024

Robert D.Miles,Esq.
P.O.Box 1022
Brunswick,Ga.31521
1-912-265-3374

The agenda and informational materials is normally compiled by the State Bar staff and submitted to all Board Members approximately 2-3 weeks prior to meeting.

Sincerely yours,

/s/Cliff Brashier
Asst. Exec. Director for Fee Arbitration

CB/rip

CC:MR.J.Alvin Leaphart
Mr.Robert Miles
Mr.Richard Bradley
Judge F.Jack Adams
Wm P.Franklin,Jr.
Mr.Max Hardy,Jr.
Mr.J.A.WIngate
Mr.John Mitchell
Omer Franklin,
Allen A.Kirwin

STATE BAR OF GEORGIA
FEE ARBITRATION AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS

JUNE 20,1983 - by CHIEF ASS'T. EXEC.Dir.
CLIFF BRASHIER

Referring the FEE ARBITRATION for ATTY.FEE to opposing Counsel, ALVIN LEAPHART,BOARD OF GOVERNOR MEMBER, STATE BAR OF GEORGIA showing conflict of interest under FEE ARBITRATION RULE 6-105, 247 Ga.A-2(1980) SHOWING " A POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE TO OPPOSING COUNSEL,BOARD OF GOVERNOR MEMBER, ALVIN LEAPHART, OPPOSING COUNSEL IN BANKRUPTCY COURT CASE No.280-00157 of JANUARY 16, 1981, DISMISSED by JUDGE COOLIDGE on January 16,1981,and order of ABSTENTATION entered by JUDGE COOLIDGE denying due process of law and denial of equal protection under law.Cited at COLONIAL MEMORIAL GARDENS,INC.et al vs. FIRST VIRGINIA BANK OF FAIRFAX COUNTY,VA. TRUSTEE, Interpreting U.S.C. TITLE II, SECTION 305(a),showing violations of the rights of creditors unsecured and intervening creditors by Judge Coolidge,1-16-1981. 9 Bankruptcy Code,page 532."

Atty.fees denied to Petitioner Woodward.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR

THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

SAVANNAH DIVISION

IN RE: JOHN R.WOODWARD,III CR.NO. 481-4

Alleged Contempt of Bankruptcy Court Judge Coolidge on 1-16-1981-heard before Hon. B. AVANT EDENFIELD, U.S.DISTRICT COURT, S/D Ga.,2:30 P.M.,on August 12,1982,SAVANNAH.

TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENCE AND PROCEEDINGS AND JUDGMENT OF THE COURT 80 Pages

See RECORD

APPEARANCES

FOR U.S.GOVERNMENT-Joseph Newman,Esq.
Ass't. U.S.Attorney
Fed.Ct.-Savannah,Ga.

FOR THE DEFENDANT-JOHN R.WOODWARD,III,ESQ.
PRO SE
Attorney at Law
410 N.Palm Street,Jesup, Georgia,under authority of:

(SELDON B.GRAHAM,JR.,Pro SE
Vs.
Three or more members of the Army Reserve General Officer Selection Board
556 Fed.Supp.,670 (1)
83-2223-5th Cir.Ct.of Appeals of the U.S.)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 11th CIRCUIT, 56 Forsyth St., N.W.

ATLANTA, GEORGIA, 30303

CASE NO. 81-7265 IN RE: RALPH B. SMITH, D/B/A JESUP PHARMACY vs. VALU-RITE PHARMACIES, INC.; FOREMOST-MCKESSON, INC. FORMAC, INC.: AD VANTAGE AD, INC., WHITEHALL LABORATORIES, INC., JOHN R. WOODWARD, III, INTERVENOR PETITIONERS.

ORDER DIRECTING THIS CASE REFERRED TO GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE STATE BAR OF GA. GENERAL COUNSEL, OMER W. FRANKLIN, JR. dated JULY 8, 1982, REGARDING CONTEMPT OF COURT ALLEGATIONS in case 481-4 of Judge B. AVANT EDENFIELD.

Order dated and Filed July 8, 1982 by JOHN C. GODBOLD, CHIEF JUDGE, 11th U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS.

(MEMO-THIS ORDER OF July 8, 1982 did not specify any action by the State Bar of Georgia, on July 8, 1982 by Judge Godbold.)

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
In The Matter Of: RALPH B. SMITH,
D/B/A JESUP PHARMACY NUMBER 280-00157

Hearing on Involuntary Bankruptcy P'TION
ORDER ON BANKRUPTCY PETITION

January 16,1981, Savannah,Georgia, Judge
HERMAN W.COOLIDGE Presiding.

Appearances:John R.Woodward,III, for the
Petitioners,Intervenors
:Alvin Leaphart,for Debtor

SEE TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL AND ORDER THAT
WAS FOR 76 Pages and Exhibits entered by
AD VANTAGE AD,INC.,PETITIONER OF AND FOR
INTERVENTION; INTERVENTION PETITION BY
WHITEHALL LABORATORIES,INC.; INTERVENT-
ION BY JOHN R.WOODWARD,III,FOR ATTY.FEES
Authorized in contracts,to be set and
awarded by the COURT of PETITIONERS,
FOREMOST-McKESSON,INC.;FORMAC,INC., and
VALU-RITE PHARMACIES INC. 6 petitioning
creditors in Involuntary Bankruptcy.
SEE TRANSCRIPT OF 76 Page Record.

STATE BAR OF GEORGIA
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

June 30, 1989

Mr. John R. Woodward, III
410 N. Palm Street
Jesup, Georgia, 31545

In Re: John R. Woodward, III Dues Check Case

Dear Mr. Woodward:

Once you rejected the offer of an Investigative Panel Reprimand in the above referenced matter, this case was set for reconsideration by the Panel at the May 19, 1989, meeting.

In view of the suspension with requirement that you take and pass the Georgia Bar Exam prior to reinstatement, the Panel voted to place the dues check case on inactive status. This matter will remain on inactive status until such time as you are reinstated to the practice of law in the State of Georgia.

Yours very truly,

/s/ Joe David Jackson
Assistant General Counsel

JDJ/cr